



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/878,047	06/07/2001	Clinton L. Ballard	BA1.P26	1636

21450 7590 10/12/2005

STEVEN P. KODA
KODA LAW OFFICE
19689 - 7TH AVE NE
NO. 307
POULSBO, WA 98370

EXAMINER

TIV, BACKHEAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/878,047	BALLARD, CLINTON L.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Backhean Tiv	2151	

All Participants:

 (1) Backhean Tiv.

(2) _____.

Status of Application: Allowed

 (3) Steven Koda.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10/6/05
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

Claim 11

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Contacted STEVEN Koda concerning 112 2nd paragraph issues, lack of antecedent basis in claim 11. On line 12, 21, 27, and 30 there is a lack of antecedent basis for the limitation of "the forwarding server", and on lines 18-19, 22-23, 28, 31, there is a lack of antecedent basis for the limitation of, "the destination address". Since the application has been issued, the examiner suggested the applicant file a Certificate of Correction. The applicant agrees that the limitations do lack antecedent basis. The examiner suggests the applicant amends, "a forwarding computer" to "a forwarding server". And amend "the destination address" to "a destination address" on line 18.